

***Village of Barrington***  
***Plan Commission***  
Minutes Summary

Date: April 8, 2003

Time: 7 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Bush, Chair  
Curt Larsen, Vice Chair  
Bhagwant Sidhu  
Harry Burroughs  
Steve Mack  
Steve Morrissey

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral and Jeff O'Brien, Planners  
Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

***Call to Order***

Mrs. Bush called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chair, present; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, absent; Steve Morrissey, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

**Plan Commission 02-05 continued Wamberg Family Limited Partnership, 700 West Main Street**

**Mrs. Bush said we had heard petitioner's presentation and Mr. Sbiral began the staff presentation.**

- Petitioner presentation
- Plan Commissioners' questions of petitioner
- Staff Report
- Plan Commissioner's questions.
- Petitioner response
- Staff response
- Public comment
- Then Commission deliberation.
- Meeting would end at 9 p.m.
- If meeting were not complete, it would be continued.

Mr. Sbiral noted a change in the staff report noted in italics. He noted that the changes were made in response to a letter from the petitioner. Mr. Sbiral noted that the letter was included with the staff report.

Mr. Sbiral went through the recommendations of the staff.

Staff recommends that the submitted plan (with annexation and disconnection) be recommended for approval by the Plan Commission to the Board of Trustees with the following conditions:

1. A 40,000 square foot reduction in total building area (directly attributable to the excess determined in the traffic study resulting in a rise from 5.9% to 7.7% at the intersection of Dundee Avenue and Main Street). The 40,000 square foot reduction could be taken from

- any one or any combination of the proposed lots.
2. A requirement included in the intergovernmental agreement prohibiting uses other than conservation/open space, public use, or 5 acre single family homes on Commercial Lot 5.
3. A left-turn lane on Hart Road at Northwest Highway be constructed, as well as a right-turn lane on Northwest Highway at Hart Road.
4. Access to the traffic signal at Hart Road and the High School property (via a bridge over Flint Creek) must be established with the development of the first building. All future parking lots be connected to and have the ability to access the High School traffic signal.
5. Separate left-turn and right-turn lanes on Hart Road and Main Street at the site entrances must be built.

If this is not acceptable to the parties involved (Wamberg Family Partnership and the Village of Barrington Hills), Staff recommends continuation of the Public Hearing for consideration of conditional approval of the alternate plan (VOB parcel only) with the following conditions:

1. A 40,000 square foot reduction in building area (directly attributable to the excess determined in the traffic study resulting in a rise from 5.9% to 7.7% at the intersection of Dundee Avenue and Main Street). The 40,000 square foot reduction could be taken from any one or any combination of the proposed lots.
2. It must be noted that staff has serious concerns regarding storm water management, wetland mitigation, and watershed protection under this plan. Additional materials equivalent to those submitted for the primary plan must be submitted for a continued public hearing.
3. Exceptions for building setbacks to move buildings in front of parking areas should be favorably considered.
4. A left-turn lane on Hart Road at Northwest Highway be constructed, as well as a right-turn lane on Northwest Highway at Hart Road.
5. Access to the traffic signal at Hart Road and the High School property (via a bridge over Flint Creek) must be established with the development of the first building. All future parking lots be connected to and have the ability to access the High School traffic signal.
6. Separate left-turn and right-turn lanes on Hart Road and Main Street at the site entrances must be built.

Staff believes the Plan Commission should hear and analyze the petition as submitted. Following the petitioner presentation, Staff report, and public comment, the Commission should deliberate and consider the proposed development.

Mr. Tom Adomshick, Village of Barrington traffic engineer, who was previously sworn in, recapped the three critical intersections.

Mr. Adomshick noted that the petitioner had provided updated traffic counts for Dundee and Main Street and an updated analysis and taking into consideration of the current timing, which is different from the previous study.

Mr. Adomshick noted that with the updated information some discrepancies exist and the assumptions made by the petitioner's traffic consultant raise some concerns. He noted that these concerns don't effect the analysis and with some minor tweaking of the traffic signals a few seconds would be saved. Mr. Adomshick stated that with this change, the petitioner would maintain the intersection's the level of service.

Ms. Bush asked if this was with or without staff's recommendation for a further reduction in overall square footage.

Mr. Adomshick said that with a tweaking of the signal phase the level of service for the intersection of Main and Dundee would remain the same without a further reduction of square footage.

Mr. Adomshick noted that traffic counts on Dundee Avenue were not significantly affected by the development. He noted that without the reduction in square footage and the proposed traffic improvements (including extending turn lanes and improving signal timing) the intersection would function at an acceptable level of service without the reduction in square footage.

Mr. Adomshick stated that the intersection of Hart Rd and Northwest Highway presented some concerns. He noted that the analysis in the petitioner's submittal was received only a couple of days before the hearing and a detailed report could not be produced. Mr. Adomshick noted that in going through the petitioner's report, he identified technical issues with the original analysis. Mr. Adomshick stated that some of the petitioner's assumptions regarding traffic flow were incorrect in his opinion.

Mr. Adomshick noted that Metro's study had assumed that some of the proposed improvements were already in place. He noted that the petitioner also provided a number of alternates for signal time. Considering Illinois Department of Transportation is in process of studying the signal timings, it appears that the wait time at an intersection will be increased by 15 seconds and the traffic flow can be allotted to various roads and intersections.

Mr. Adomshick noted that in the updated analysis, Metro included changes and assumptions, which he thought would be reasonable.

Mr. Adomshick discussed further signalization issues at the Hart Rd and Northwest Highway intersections and how changes would affect traffic flows. He noted that staff's proposed improvements along with improved signal timing would raise the level of service from Level E to Level C.

Mr. Adomshick noted that based on his analysis, reduction in the level of service for the Hart Rd-Northwest Highway intersection, will be worse for northbound traffic.

Mr. Larsen asked if improving turns lanes would relieve some of the traffic flow on Hart Road and Main Street.

Mr. Adomshick said that it could potentially improve flows, but that he has not looked at an analysis of those improvements. He noted that what is proposed maximizes flow and capacity.

Mrs. Sidhu asked about signal timing on Hart Road and who would pay for that improvement.

Mr. Sbiral summarized there are some discrepancies between Mr. Adomshick and the staff. He noted that staff feels that what improvements should be made and who pays are policy issues. Mr. Sbiral stated that the petitioners are asking for annexation and disconnection that would have negative impact on traffic regardless of the technical information.

**Mr. Tom Hayward, Attorney for the Wambergers and  
Mr. David Miller, Metro Transportation, Consultant for the petitioner**

Mr. Miller felt that certain statements in the staff report were incorrect. He noted that there will not be significant cut through traffic. He said that he had reviewed Mr. Adomshick's reports. Mr. Miller noted that the traffic from the petitioner's proposal would be counter flow and asked what staff's basis was for requesting a further reduction in square footage.

Mr. Sbiral noted that staff believes the development will significantly affect intersections and that the reduction in square footage will substantially maintain the current level of service.

Mr. Admoshick and Mr. Miller discussed the implications of the additional traffic and what the level of service means regarding waiting time for persons at the intersections of Main St. & Hart Rd and Main St & Dundee Avenue.

There was further discussion about the assumptions that the petitioner's traffic study had made and comparisons between the Wamberg's proposals and other projects that had occurred within suburban Chicagoland.

Mr. Miller noted that he thought the statement relative to the development's impact was incorrect. He noted that the time delay at the intersections was minimal when studying Commercial Lots 1-4.

Mr. Miller noted that with a regional improvement, funds are available to make traffic improvements from Lake County DOT and Metra. He noted that the petitioner is willing to put \$80,000 (or \$20,000 per building) into an escrow. Mr. Miller urged staff to look into SEMAC funds to aid in financing the improvements. He noted that the petitioner's contribution can improve the Village's chances of receiving public funding for the improvements. Mr. Miller noted that traffic is generated on a regional level and not all responsibility for the improvements should fall on this development. He noted that the incremental impact from the development is minimal.

Mr. Miller discussed the connection over Flint Creek to Hart Rd. He noted that the staff report noted that this should be done at the time Commercial Lots 1 & 2 are developed. Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Adomshick's analysis requires an updated gap study by the petitioner at that time to determine if the connection over Flint Creek was needed.

Mr. Hayward indicated that the staff report talked about increased density. He noted that there was originally 240,000 square feet of usable space proposed for this project. Mr. Hayward stated that the Wamberg's are not typical developers. He stated that his clients wanted to build a building for their New York Stock Exchange Company in the village.

Mr. Hayward said that 83% of property would remain as green space and that the petitioners have taken in account several items when considering what to do with the property.

Mr. Hayward noted that the staff report recommends approval, with 7 conditions. He wanted to address those conditions.

1. Staff's request for an additional 40,000 reduction in square footage has been addressed by the two traffic consultants and would be unnecessary. He noted that traffic at the intersections will not require a further reduction. Mr. Hayward also noted that the petitioner had already reduced the project's overall square footage at the request of the Plan Commission.
2. He noted that Lot 5 is in Village of Barrington Hills and it has no access to Hart Rd and no sewer and water. Mr. Hayward noted the Village of Barrington has control over these items.
3. Mr. Hayward discussed left turn and right turn signalization improvements. Mr. Miller respectfully suggests that the problem was there already there. Mr. Hayward suggested the village work with Lake County, Metro, and IDOT along the petitioner to make improvements to the intersection of Northwest Hwy and Hart Road. He noted that the petitioner was also offering \$20,000 to help with the improvements.
4. Mr. Hayward addressed the connection over Flint Creek. He noted that the petitioner would complete a gap study to determine if it was needed at the time the Commercial Lots 1 & 2 are developed.
5. He noted that the separate turn lanes are already in the plans and the petitioner had agreed to this improvement.
6. Mr. Hayward stated that the petitioner agreed to extend the left turn lane on Main Street 500 feet and this was also in the plans. He noted that the petitioner accepts the letter of credit recommendation.

7. He finally stated that the Intergovernmental Agreement is in the hands of Village Attorneys and is only waiting for the recommendation of this commission.

Mr. Bush asked if the final draft of the intergovernmental agreement was not available.

Mr. Hayward said that the Plan Commission had received a copy of the final draft in their previous packet.

Mr. Hayward said unless all seven conditions of the staff report are met, the Plan Commission should deny the petition. He said the petitioners agreed with 3 of the 7 conditions and asked Plan Commission to take that into the account during deliberations as well as what is good for the village. Mr. Hayward noted that there is a lot of good in this 70-acre parcel. He finally stated that the petitioners hoped that Plan Commission would recommend approval of this proposal.

Ms. Bush asked about the letter that Mr. Larsen and her had sent to the petitioner regarding the alternative plan. She questioned why the petitioners were not interested in pursuing the alternative plan.

Mr. Sbral stated that the Zoning Ordinance stated that a planned development was allowed on any configuration of land as long as that land is in the Village of Barrington. He noted that with the intergovernmental agreement, it would be fairer to look at what the petitioners are presenting. He noted that village attorney has only a draft of the intergovernmental agreement and will work with the petitioner on drafting language after the Plan Commission makes its recommendation.

Mr. Bush swore in those who would be giving testimony.

**Mr. Dan Frommeyer a former Village of Barrington Trustee and Chairman of Chamber of Commerce of Barrington, 1210 Oakridge Rd**

**Ms. Janet Meyer, President of Chamber of Commerce**

Mr. Frommeyer and Ms. Meyer read a statement from the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce, which supported the proposal. The letter was distributed to the Plan Commission

**Mr. Willard Brown, 137 West Lincoln, a real estate developer.**

Mr. Brown spoke in favor of development as presented. He noted that it was a good use of the property. Mr. Brown noted that a corporate headquarters in Barrington is good for the economy. He also stated that it is a low-density use and it felt it was the lowest density of any office developments he has any seen. Mr. Brown saw some major economic developments and few demands on village services. He agrees that downtown Barrington needs support and needs revitalization. He noted three things that would help achieve this goal, first, more people living close to downtown, including multifamily dwellings; second, additional retail anchors in the downtown; and, finally encourage developments, which will bring people downtown to lunch and shopping. Mr. Brown noted that traffic is always an issue in Barrington, but that it is everywhere else.

Mr. Brown stated that the traffic problems stem from persons commuting through Barrington and that traffic problems are not caused entirely by Barrington developments. He stated that he didn't believe that the high school traffic would cause any issues. Mr. Brown noted that reducing development hurts residents of the Village.

**John Knight 13 Ashford Lane, Barrington Hills, serves on Zoning Commission in Barrington Hills**

Mr. Knight stated that he has a business in Barrington and that the Village is in unique position to see a large development. He thought that the petitioners had been sensitive to aesthetics of the Village. Mr. Knight noted that developers usually try to max out a site such as the subject property. As a professional developer, he was immensely impressed by the proposal and thought it should be considered for approval.

Mr. Larsen asked Mr. Sbral about the PUD.

Mr. Sbral clarified that the portion of the property that is in the Village of Barrington.

Mr. Burroughs asked about annexing Lot 5 in Barrington Hills to control development.

Mr. Sibal said that the Barrington Hills and the petitioner did not want to have Lot 5 annexed into the Village of Barrington. He stated that Village has control of sewer and water, which might control the development.

Mr. Morrissey, asked about the sequence of approvals.

Mr. Sibal said that both villages are waiting for results of Plan Commission. He said that Village of Barrington has the draft agreement and following the Plan Commission, the proposal will go the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Morrissey asked if this process was typical.

Mr. Sibal said both parties had agreed to this process.

Mr. Hayward said they approached both villages and they suggested the procedure. He noted that in Barrington Hill's the petitioners were sent to Zoning Commission who recommended approval and next Monday night the Barrington Hills' Plan Commission will make its recommendation. Mr. Hayward noted that the petition was filed simultaneous with Barrington and was referred to the Plan Commission. He noted that several months ago, the petitioners filed the first draft of the intergovernmental agreement with both village attorneys. Mr. Hayward said that both of them said that until the Plan Commissions and Boards of Trustees had approved the petition, they would not go forward with the intergovernmental agreement.

Mr. Hayward stated that the petitioners have been proceeding with Barrington Hills and have been waiting for several months to work with the Village of Barrington Hills' village attorney. He said that this process was not unusual. Mr. Hayward noted that when new Hart Hard Road was built, it went through the same process.

Mr. Burroughs asked Mr. Hayward if they have been before the Barrington Hills Plan Commission. He asked whether they had concerns about the traffic.

Ms. Bush said most of traffic was flowing through Barrington and would not be very burdensome to Barrington Hills.

Ms. Sidhu asked Mr. Sibal about the conservation easement.

Mr. Sibal noted that the Village did not have any other protections other than the easement. He stated that the easement is primarily within Barrington Hills.

Mr. Hayward said all of the green parcel on the diagram will be subject as a conservation easement and this should be included in any recommendation made by the Plan Commission. He stated that the petitioners wanted to be good stewards of the property and the Flint Creek watershed. He noted some of the environmental problems that the petitioners had remediated prior to this petition.

Mr. Morrissey asked about the sequence and process for seeking the intergovernmental agreement. He asked if the petitioners are using care in presenting the same plan. Mr. Morrissey also wanted to ensure the plan will not be changed.

Ms. Sidhu asked which Village had control over Lot 5.

Mr. Hayward said there were substantial controls for the Village of Barrington. He noted that there is no understanding for access to Hart Road and that that decision is under jurisdiction of Lake County. Mr. Hayward said that both Villages will have review over what is built on Lot 5.

Mr. Morrissey asked about Lot 5 and pedestrian access to Oak Knoll Road. He noted that a bike path over Flint Creek would be desirable. He asked about the possibility of including this connection.

Mr. Hayward said that the connection would be though open space. He pointed out that any bike path would not be an asphalt path; it would be a more natural surface. Mr. Hayward stated that if this plan commission wanted to include a path, the petitioner would be happy to include it.

Ms. Bush closed public comment.

Mr. Larsen stated that one of the reasons the Plan Commission requested an alternate plan was that they could not see any particular benefit to the annexation of the land when a piece property could be developed in a similar form entirely in the Village of Barrington. He noted that petitioner had not provided the Plan Commission with a serious alternate plan. Mr. Larsen also expressed concern that the petitioner did not want to follow 4 of the 7 recommendations of staff. He noted that based on this, he was inclined to deny the petition.

Ms. Bush stated that she did not have a problem with the Clark Bardes building. She noted that it would be a wonderful replacement for the former UARCO building. Ms. Bush stated that the petitioners' request for 6 buildings would have significant impact on traffic in the Village of Barrington. She noted that the conservation district is good and she was pleased that the Wambers saw that as valuable.

Ms. Bush noted that she was very concerned about Lot 5. She was worried that the Village of Barrington Hills would reap all of the benefit and that Barrington would have to bear the traffic burden. She noted that the development would generate more tax dollars for the village, but those benefits would be out-weighted by the traffic. Ms. Bush noted that she was disappointed that the petitioner was unwilling to look at alternative plans.

Mr. Morrissey was enthusiastic about revitalizing the downtown and accepted that extra vehicular traffic would be generated. He did appreciate the innovative approach to the escrow for traffic improvements. He thought it was important the Chamber supported the petitioner. Mr. Morrissey noted that as a businessperson, he was cautious to hold a development hostage to traffic. He expressed concern over the discrepancies in the traffic studies. He respect staff's opinion and did not support staff's recommendation to reduce density

Mr. Morrissey stated that he would support the project if it were done on a piece by piece, lot by lot basis.

Ms. Sidhu stated that she would like the bike path to be added and that the conservation effort was important. She stated that she would like the petitioners to follow the seven recommendations of staff.

Mr. Burroughs would enjoy seeing project coming about but he was concerned with Lot 5 the amount of control the Village of Barrington had over it. He noted that Lot 5 would bring in additional traffic to the Village. Mr. Burroughs noted that the burden would have to be on the petitioner to help solve the traffic problem. He noted that the Village is stuck with trying to solve traffic problems and he would like to get additional help with roadway improvement in some manner. Mr. Burroughs stated that he would like to some how gain more control over Lot 5 through the intergovernmental agreement. He didn't see the need for all these office buildings as the Village already has enough empty office buildings. Mr. Burroughs noted that he could support this project but additional traffic improvements and more control over Lot 5 was needed.

Mr. Mack concurred with Mr. Morrissey about Mr. Brown's comments. He liked the project, especially the Clark Bardes building and its architecture, but he thought the Village needed to have control over the

building footprints and especially on Lot 5. Mr. Mack noted that traffic is going to grow anyway, but Lot 5 could exasperate the problem almost instantly. He noted that he would like to endorse the project without qualifications and he also didn't think staff's recommendation for an additional reduction of 40,000 square feet was needed. Mr. Mack stated that the Village needed firmer control in the intergovernmental agreement relative to Lot 5.

*Mr. Larsen moved to deny the petition relative the petitioners' response to the Plan Commission's request for an alternate plan..*

*Ms. Sidhu seconded.*

Mr. Morrissey moved to amend Mr. Larsen's motion to build in control for a piece by piece approval. He asked Mr. Larsen if his motion for denial stemmed from his concern over the annexation.

Mr. Larsen stated that the Plan Commission had not been given the opportunity to consider the project completed entirely within the Village of Barrington's boundaries. He noted that the petitioner stated that the desire to annex the property is motivated by the desire to have the Clark Bardes building fronting Lake Cook Road. Mr. Larsen said he thought that this could be accomplished without annexation.

Mr. Hayward said the UARCO building extended into Barrington Hills

Mr. Larsen said if the petitioner stayed in the location of the former UARCO building, they could achieve their goals.

Mr. Hayward said that the petitioners spent a lot of time locating the Clark Bardes building. He noted that the change in location would change the style of architecture from a prairie-style building to a typical 3-story building.

Mr. Hayward addressed the statement regarding ignoring staff's request. The petitioners agreed to conditions for Lot 5 since the Village of Barrington ultimately controls the development with access to sewer and water and the Lake County DOT could deny access to Hart Road.

Mr. Hayward said that the petitioners did not ignore staff, they simply suggested alternatives to financing the road improvements. He noted that the intersection of Northwest Hwy and Hart Rd was controlled by many federal, state, and local agencies.

Ms. Bush said what she was trying to understand what staff recommendations the petitioner was agreeing with.

Mr. Hayward stated that the petitioners are asking for a favorable recommendation to Village of Barrington Board of Trustees.

Mr. Morrissey asked whether this new insight would flip motion around.

Mr. Larsen provided clarification on the intent of the motion.

Ms. Sidhu was in favor of staff's conditions.

Mr. Burroughs stated that he liked first plan better than alternative. He noted that he was still unhappy with staff's conditions and would have different conditions attached to any approval.

Mr. Mack agreed with Mr. Burroughs.

*Mr. Larsen restated, motion to deny petition. Ms. Sidhu seconded  
The motion failed for lack of a majority.*



There was a discussion relative to what motion the Plan Commission could make

*Mr. Morrissey moved to approve the petitioner with conditions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 of staff plus the requirement that a bike path be added to connect the development with Oak Knoll Rd. Mr. Morrissey noted that he was satisfied with escrow deposit of \$20,000 for each building for traffic improvements and would require the petitioner include another \$20,000 for Lot 5.*

Mr. Sbiral said he didn't think the Plan Commission could include Lot 5 in the recommendation. He noted that the reduction in square footage was tied to density and traffic.

*Mr. Mack seconded Mr. Morrissey's motion.*

Mr. Sbiral stated that public works has standards for bike paths within the Village of Barrington and asked if Mr. Morrissey wanted to clarify this portion of his conditions.

Mr. Morrissey stated that he wouldn't care to specify. He noted that the petitioner could chose which surface to utilize.

Mr. Larsen asked whether this motion included Lots 2-4.

Mrs. Bush clarified said it was approval of 6 buildings on 4 lots with prior site approval.

Mr. Sbiral noted that this is the final plan for Clark Bardes building and the subdivision of lots and a preliminarily plan for all other buildings.

Mr. Morrissey asked if there was a way to limit the buildings.

Mr. Sbiral said they would be required to come back for final site approval. He noted that any future buyer of land might want to change site or building. Mr. Sbiral stated that the plan was basically putting maximum caps on square footage.

Mr. Morrissey asked the only caps were final.

Mr. Larsen said it was preliminary approval for all 6 buildings.

Mr. Mack clarified that they would have to go through Architectural Review Commission for the rest of buildings and he noted that the Plan Commission has capped total square footage. Mr. Mack asked about parking

Mr. Sbiral said that the use dictated the parking needed for square footage. He said the petitioners have adequate parking but they have requested land banking for some of the spaces.

Mr. Morrissey said it was not under consideration to approve lot by lot, he noted that his motion is all or nothing.

Ms. Bush stated that that was a problem.

Mr. Sbiral said the request is for a final approval for Lot 1 and preliminary approval for Lots 2, 3, and 4. He noted that the Plan Commission would have to approve subdivision of property otherwise there isn't a Lot 1.

Ms. Bush asked if it were possible break the approval up.

Mr. Sbiral said it was possible to do this.

Mr. Morrissey said he wanted to retain some control while not chasing away the project through further delays or complexities. He stated that the Plan Commission should approve the annexation and disconnection and subdivision of the property as well as provide an final approval for Lot 1 with conditions 2,4, 5, 6, 7 from the staff report and a bike path. He suggested denying the remaining lots and recommending preliminary approval of the development of those lots.

Mr. Larsen said he didn't think the petition could be divided up in this manner.

Mr. Sbiral said he thought these items were stated separately in the original petition.

Ms. Bush said this was only a recommendation and that the board could accept and/or send the petition back to the Plan Commission. She stated that the Village retains the right for annexation and disconnection and the petitioners can build what they want in the Village of Barrington.

Mr. Sbiral pointed out what the Plan Commission could do.

Ms. Bush suggested a continuation to get an opinion from counsel to determine what motion could be made.

There was a discussion relative to possible meeting dates.

Mr. Hayward stated that as a land use lawyer he didn't see any problems with Mr. Morrissey's motion. He stated that he didn't oppose sending the motion to the village attorney for an opinion. Mr. Hayward pointed out that the petitioners could develop the property as it currently exists, but they thought that their plan made more sense for both villages.

Ms. Bush stated that she wanted to get a written opinion from the village attorney relative to what could be done by the Plan Commission.

**Mr. Larsen moved to continue this case to April 22 at 7:00 PM. Mr. Burroughs seconded. Roll Call noted the following: Ms. Bush, yes; Ms. Sidhu, yes; Mr. Morrissey, yes; Mr. Burroughs, yes; Mr. Mack, yes; Mr. Larsen, yes. Motion carries.**

MINUTES TO BE CONSIDERED ON April 22

### ***Adjournment***

Mr. Larsen moved and Mr. Mack seconded to adjourn the meeting. Voice vote recorded all ayes. The Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

---

Anna Bush, Chair  
Plan Commission